

REMARKS

The above amendments and these remarks are responsive to the Office Action issued on April 7, 2005. By this response, claims 1-5 are amended to clarify claim scope, but the scope is not narrowed in any way related to patentability. The specification and the Abstract of Disclosure are also amended address formality issues. No new matter is added. Claims 1-7 are now active for examination. A petition for a one-month extension of time is submitted concurrently herewith.

The Office Action rejected claims 1-7 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph mainly for claim language of claim 1. Claims 1, 4 and 6 stood rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Ramasamy (U.S. Published Patent Application No. 20040125018). Claim 7 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Ramasamy in view of Ito (U.S. Patent No. 6,469,670). The Examiner indicated that claims 2, 3 and 5 would be allowable if they are rewritten into independent form including every limitation of claim 1, with revisions to address the rejection of claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph. Fig. 15 was objected to for failing to include a radio wave absorption belt 1439, and the Abstract was objected to for including more than one paragraph.

Applicants respectfully submit that the claim rejections are overcome and the objections are addressed in view of the amendments and/or remarks presented herein.

The Rejection under 35 U.S.C. §112, Second Paragraph Is Overcome

Claims 1-7 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph mainly for claim language of claim 1. Claims 2-7 were rejected by virtue of their respective dependencies from claim 1.

The Examiner is thanked for the courtesy for extending telephone discussions with Applicant's representative on July 7, 2007, and considering sufficiency of proposed claim

amendment in overcoming the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph. The Examiner indicated that claim 1, after the amendment presented in this Response, would overcome the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph. It is respectfully submitted that claims 1-7, as amended, are now in appropriate form for examination.

The Anticipation Rejection of Claims 1, 4 and 6 Is Overcome

Claims 1, 4 and 6 were rejected as being anticipated by Ramasamy. The anticipation rejection is respectfully overcome because Ramasamy cannot support a prima facie case of anticipation.

Claim 1, as amended, describes a printed circuit board that includes a first conductive plane connected to power supply potential and a second conductive plane connected to ground potential. The first and second conductive planes are formed such that an electric field generated by a potential difference between the first conductive plane and the second conductive plane is concentrated on one side of one of the first conductive plane and the second conductive plane. A wireless communication board mounted to the printed circuit board and the conductive plane associated with the concentrated electric field are on different sides relative to the other one of the first conductive plane and the second conductive plane that is not associated with the concentrated electric field. An exemplary structure of a printed circuit board according to claim 1 is shown in Fig. 4B. Such structure reduces noise effects on the wireless communication board without the need to increase the distance between a noise source and the wireless communication board.

In contrast, according to the board structure illustrated in Fig. 18 of the Ramasamy reference, an antenna 73R is disposed between the GND plane 76-11 and the Power plane 76-12. In other words, antenna 73 is exposed to the electric field coupling generated by GND plane 76-11 and Power plane 76-12. Accordingly, Ramasamy fails to disclose that a wireless communication board mounted to the printed circuit board and the conductive plane associated

with the concentrated electric field are on different sides relative to the other one of the first conductive plane and the second conductive plane that is not associated with the concentrated electric field, as described in claim 1.

Furthermore, according to claim 1, the first conductive plane (connected to power supply potential) and the second conductive plane (connected to ground potential) are formed in a way such that an electric field generated by a potential difference between the first conductive plane and the second conductive plane is concentrated on one side of one of the first conductive plane and the second conductive plane. On the other hand, in Ramasamy, the electric field generated by GND plane 76-11 and Power plane 76-12 is distributed between GND plane 76-11 and Power plane 76-12. Consequently, Ramasamy fails to teach that “an electric field generated by a potential difference between the first conductive plane and the second conductive plane is concentrated on one side of one of the first conductive plane and the second conductive plane,” as recited in claim 1.

Since Ramasamy fails to disclose every limitation of claim 1, Ramasamy cannot support a prima facie case of anticipation. The anticipation rejection of claim 1 is untenable and should be withdrawn. Favorable reconsideration of claim 1 is respectfully requested.

Claims 4 and 6, directly or indirectly, depend on claim 1 and incorporate every limitation thereof. Therefore, claims 4 and 6 also are patentable over Ramasamy for at least the same reasons as for claim 1, as well as based on their own merits. Favorable reconsideration of claims 4 and 6 is respectfully requested.

The Obviousness Rejection of Claim 7 Is Overcome

Claim 7 indirectly depends on claim 1 and incorporates every limitation thereof. It is respectfully submitted that the obviousness rejection of claim 7 based on Ramasamy and Ito is overcome because the references cannot support a prima facie case of obviousness.

As already discussed above relative to claim 1, Ramasamy fails to disclose that a wireless communication board mounted to the printed circuit board and the conductive plane associated with the concentrated electric field are on different sides relative to the other one of the first conductive plane and the second conductive plane that is not associated with the concentrated electric field, and that an electric field generated by a potential difference between the first conductive plane and the second conductive plane is concentrated on one side of one of the first conductive plane and the second conductive plane, as described in claim 1, the feature of which is incorporated in claim 7 by virtue of its dependency from claim 1. Ito, the other reference relied on by the Office Action, also fails to disclose these features. Therefore, Ramasamy and Ito, even if combined, do not teach every feature of claim 7. Accordingly, Ramasamy and Ito cannot support a prima facie case of obviousness. The obviousness rejection is untenable and should be withdrawn. Favorable reconsideration of claim 7 is respectfully requested.

The Objection to Claims 2, 3 and 5 Is Addressed

Claims 2, 3 and 5 depend on claim 1 and were objected to for depending on a rejected base claim, but the Examiner indicated that claims 2, 3 and 5 would be allowable if they are rewritten into independent form incorporating every limitation from the base claim.

As discussed above, claim 1, as amended, is patentable over documents of record. It is respectfully submitted that claims 2, 3 and 5 are in appropriate form.

The Objections to the Abstract and Fig. 15 Are Addressed

Fig. 15 was objected to for failing to include a radio wave absorption belt 1439, and the Abstract is objected to for including more than one paragraph.

By this Response, the Specification is amended to provide appropriate numeral to the absorption belt such that the numeral in the specification is consistent to that used in Fig. 15.

Furthermore, the Abstract is rewritten into appropriate form. It is submitted that the objections are addressed.

CONCLUSION

For the reasons given above, the present application claims subject matter patentable over the references of record and is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration is respectfully requested. If there are any outstanding issues that might be resolved by an interview or an Examiner's amendment, Examiner is requested to call Applicants' attorney at the telephone number shown below.

To the extent necessary, a petition for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. 1.136 is hereby made. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this paper, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account 500417 and please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

Respectfully submitted,

McDERMOTT WILL & EMERY LLP



Wei-Chen Nicholas Chen
Registration No. 56,665

600 13th Street, N.W.
Washington, DC 20005-3096
Phone: 202.756.8000 WC:apr
Facsimile: 202.756.8087
Date: July 11, 2005

**Please recognize our Customer No. 20277
as our correspondence address.**